

**DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS**  
**Accreditation Study Work Group**  
**Topic, Issues and Options Matrix**

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Purpose of Accreditation	<p>Refine the purpose of accreditation for California’s educator preparation programs, taking into consideration the policy and budget environment in California and nationally. <i>Does the current purpose of the Accreditation system as contained in the introduction of the Accreditation Framework reflect the generally agreed upon purpose(s) of accreditation today?</i></p> <p><i>NOTE: Draft language out for stakeholder feedback (11/04)</i></p>	Continue purposes as defined in <i>Accreditation Framework</i>
		<p>Modify definition of purpose of accreditation **</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose of accreditation: Ensure accountability, Adhere to standards, Ensure high quality, Support program improvement</li> <li>• Essential Attributes: Description of the attributes of the implementation accreditation system: <i>Professional Character, Breadth and flexibility, Intensity, Efficiency and cost-effectiveness</i></li> </ul>
Role of CTC and COA	<p>The Commission’s vision statement is “To ensure that those who educate the children of this state are academically and professionally prepared.” One of the Commission’s goals is to: “Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of professional educators. “ The COA has responsibility for implementing the accreditation system, while the Commission establishes policies. The COA reports to the Commission on an annual basis. <i>Do the roles and responsibilities of the Commission and COA under the current accreditation system provide appropriate oversight of teacher education and maximum efficiency?</i></p>	<p>Continue roles as defined in <i>Accreditation Framework</i> but improve communication between COA and Commission by*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) COA representative reports at all Commission meetings</li> <li>b) COA information or consent item on the agenda at each Commission meeting, or as appropriate</li> </ul>
		<p>Modify the role of the Commission in accreditation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) Commission ratification of accreditation decisions made by COA</li> <li>d) Eliminate COA, Commission makes all accreditation decisions</li> <li>e) COA initially accredits institutions instead of the Commission</li> </ul>

## DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Unit Accreditation and Program Approval	Currently California’s accreditation system involves a single accreditation decision for the institution—unit accreditation. The individual programs are approved within the process of coming to the institution’s accreditation decision. <i>Does the current system need to be modified?</i>  <i>NOTE:</i> Draft language out for Stakeholder feedback (11/04)	Continue to accredit the institution with program approval embedded in the single accreditation process.
		Move back to a program approval system without any institution wide accreditation decision
		Develop a new blended system that addresses both unit accreditation AND individual program approval in a different manner. **
Accreditation Decisions	Current Framework includes three options—Accreditation, Accreditation with Stipulations and Denial of Accreditation. Current Framework also requires all Stipulations to be cleared within one year. <i>Does this menu of options and the time frame need to be modified in any way?</i>	Yet to be addressed at the work group, COA is also discussing
Program Standard Options  <i>Accreditation Framework, Section 3</i>	Currently, there are five program standard options that institutions may choose among: California Standards, National or Professional Standards, General Standards, Experimental Standards, or Alternative Standards.  <i>Do each of the five current options provide equivalent or adequate standards for accreditation activities? Should the options be modified or changed?</i>	Continue with the current five program standard options
		Provide three program standards options: 1) California Program Standards, 2) National or Professional Program Standards, or 3) Experimental/Alternative Program Standards **
		Require all institutions to use 1) California or 2) National or Professional Program Standards
		Require all institutions to use 1) California or 2) Experimental/Alternative Program Standards
		Require all institutions to use California Program Standards only
National Unit Accreditation	Current law states that national accreditation of an educational unit may be substituted for state accreditation, if specific conditions are met. Conditions are set forth in the <i>Framework</i> . As the current accreditation system is implemented, national accreditation separate from state accreditation has not taken place in California. <i>How or should National Accreditation of the Education Unit integrate with state accreditation?</i>	Continue national unit accreditation options as defined in Ed Code and <i>Accreditation Framework</i> , no change required **
		Replace California’s accreditation process with national accreditation
		Eliminate national accreditation options
		Modify existing practice...

## DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
National Program Approval or Accreditation	Current law states that national accreditation of a specific program may be substituted for state accreditation, if specific conditions are met. Conditions are set forth in the <i>Framework</i> . As the current accreditation system is implemented, national accreditation separate from state accreditation has not taken place in California. <i>How or should National Accreditation of individual Preparation Programs integrate with state accreditation?</i>	Continue national program accreditation options as defined in Ed Code and <i>Accreditation Framework</i> , no change required
		Replace California’s program approval process with national program accreditation or approval
		Eliminate national program options
		Modify existing practice...
Data Collection	Annual, bi-annual, or periodic data collection on programs and/or the unit. Information gathered could be used to inform, and possibly structure, the site visit. <i>What type of data should be collected and analyzed 1) during the site visit, and 2) in an interim activity, or annually? How should the data impact 1) the accreditation decision and 2) the focus of the site visit?</i>  <i>What data will provide information on candidate competence? Unit</i>	Goal for institution to aggregate data, systematically review the data and use the data for program improvement
		Focus on candidate competence through pre- and post- test, TPA scores, employer survey, candidate self-assessment
		NCATE like, web based, assessment plan developed by each institution
		CTC and next review team will review what the institution submits
		Use of surveys—program completers, employers, IHE faculty to gather appropriate information
Site Level Activity—Scope and Structure	The current site visit reviews all standards—unit and program—through document review, interviews and a self-study at the institution. <i>What should take place during the site level activity? Could the site level activity benefit from increased use of technology?</i>	Continue with the current site visit as defined in the <i>Accreditation Framework</i>
		Move to a “focused site visit” that reviews only some standards or some programs
		Review the unit through the site visit. Review all programs through data collection and document review prior to site activity.

## DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Site Level Activity-Frequency	Currently, institutions have a site visit every six years (NCATE institutions every five years, although NCATE is now moving to a seven year cycle.) <i>What is the appropriate cycle for the future site level activity?</i>	Continue with the six year cycle as defined in the <i>Accreditation Framework</i>
		Move to a seven year cycle, as NCATE, but with additional data collection or activities during the interim.
		Set up a system that supports immediate intervention, if warranted
Interim Review Activities	Information was shared from the BTSA community on the informal peer review process which takes place in between the formal review site visits. The value of these activities for program improvement was emphasized. How can the accreditation system support ongoing program improvement? <i>What type of interim activities—unit or program focused—would support program improvement?</i>	Standards based review process that takes place periodically (twice between site visits.) The process could be focused on the unit or the programs, there are options for institutions, and the activity is required.*
		No interim review activity
Multiple Subject-Subject Matter Programs	Subject matter programs are initially approved by a team of readers and there has been no ongoing review of the programs after the initial approval. Multiple Subject Programs can be offered by an IHE to help candidates develop subject matter competence. <i>Should the Multiple Subject subject matter programs be reviewed (on-going review) through the accreditation or some other process?</i>	Continue current initial program approval process and no further program review
		Collect ongoing data (including CSET pass rates) from programs in lieu of a site visit **
		Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner. *
		Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system.
Single Subject-Subject Matter Programs	Subject matter programs are initially approved by a team of readers and there has been no ongoing review of the programs after the initial approval. Single Subject Programs can be offered by an IHE to satisfy the subject matter requirement. <i>Should the Single Subject subject matter programs be reviewed(on-going review) through the accreditation or some other process?</i>	Continue current initial program approval process and no further program review
		Collect ongoing data from programs in lieu of a site visit *
		Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner. *
		Include subject matter programs in the accreditation system

## DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
Blended Programs	Blended Programs that are approved by the CTC have submitted a program document that satisfies the six Blended Program standards. The institution must also have an approved subject matter and teacher preparation program. In addition many institutions have unofficial blended or integrated programs that serve the early decider. <i>Should Blended Programs—approved programs—be reviewed through the accreditation process?</i>	Continue current initial program approval process with on going review through the accreditation system
		Include approved Blended programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner. **
5 <sup>th</sup> Year Programs	Prior to SB 2042, the three Fifth Year courses were initially approved with no further review. The SB 2042 Fifth Year Programs are teacher preparation programs offered by institutions that have a Multiple Subject or Single Subject Preliminary Preparation Programs. One institution must recommend the candidate for the SB 2042 Professional Clear Credential as an alternative route to completion of induction. <i>Should 5<sup>th</sup> year programs be reviewed through the accreditation process?</i>	Continue current initial program approval process with no further review
		Include 5 <sup>th</sup> year programs in the accreditation system in a modified manner*
		Include 5 <sup>th</sup> year programs in the accreditation system as other programs*
Induction Programs	There are currently 149 Commission approved Induction Programs. In the past, the BTSA Task Force has implemented a Formal Program Review process to review the BTSA programs on a four year cycle. Now Induction Programs are the preferred path to earn the Professional Clear Credential. <i>Should Induction Programs be reviewed through the accreditation process?</i>	Continue current initial program approval process and ongoing review with Formal Program Review with oversight by the BTSA Task Force
		Include Induction Programs in the accreditation system as other programs*
		Include Induction Programs in the accreditation system, BTSA Task Force coordinates the process, and the COA accredits the programs*
Specialized Credential Programs	In addition to Multiple and Single Subject Credentials, the Commission awards credentials in many specialized areas— Special Education, Pupil Personnel Services, Administrative Services, Designated Subjects, and Intern credentials. <i>How are specialized credential programs reviewed under the current accreditation system? Should there be any modifications to the accreditation system to support the review of these programs?</i>	Continue with the current program review system as defined in the <i>Accreditation Framework</i>
		Modify the current program review system in relation to the specialized credential programs

## DRAFT – WORK IN PROGRESS

Topic	Issue(s)	Options Considered to Date
2042 Required Elements	Prior to SB 2042, the standards had “Factors to Consider” and the review teams were guided by the factors. The 2042 Standards (subject matter, teacher prep, induction and 5 <sup>th</sup> year) have “Required Elements” and the reviewers are asked to hold the institution accountable for every element.	Continue with SB 2042 Standards having “Required Elements”
		Recommend that the “Required Elements” in the SB 2042 Standards be revised to “Factors to Consider” in keeping with the attribute of flexibility in the accreditation system**
BIR Training		Yet to be addressed
Selection of COA members	The current selection process for COA members is cumbersome and costly. <i>Can the selection process be simplified, still meet the requirements of the Education Code, and support the selection of quality COA members?</i>	Yet to be addressed